

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 10, 14 and 18 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present amendments/cancellations and the following remarks are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution and early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and objections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. In addition, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 – 6 and 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nishimura (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0051904A1), hereafter “Nishimura,” in view of Christensen et. al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0154114A1), hereinafter “Christensen” and further in view of Francisco et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,875,433). Claims 7-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nishimura and Christensen, and further in view of Francisco and further in view of Leber et. al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0182391 A1), hereafter “Leber.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office and present the following arguments for the Office’s reconsideration.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections of claims 14-20, Applicant has amended claim 14 and the specification to comply with the Office's interpretation of statutory subject matter. Applicants contend that independent claims 14 and 18, as amended, are clearly directed to statutory subject matter, under §101. Claims 14 and 18 clearly fall within the statutory classes in 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of independent claims 1, 10, 14 and 18, over Nishimura, Christensen and Francisco, Applicants assert that the combination of these references does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. In addition to enumerating previously presented arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, singly or in combination, do not disclose "obtaining government regulatory information from a customer that is required to comply with disclosure and reporting requirements for a purchase of chemicals via the custom data form" as required by amended claims 1, 10, 14 and 18.

As the Office admits, "the combination of Nishimura and Christensen et al. still does not teach obtaining government regulatory information from a customer that is required as part of the electronic purchase via the custom data form." Office Action, p. 5. For disclosure of this element, the Office points to a third reference, Francisco. However, Francisco does not read on the claims as amended.

Interpreting Francisco for purposes of this response only, Francisco does not display a custom form in which the customer fills out information that needs to be submitted to a government regulatory body in order to comply with disclosure and reporting requirements for a purchase of chemicals. Applicants further submit that secondary references, Leber and

Christensen do not cure the deficiencies of Nishimura. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the corresponding independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all the rejections.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique feature. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2008

/Meghan Q. Toner/  
Meghan Q. Toner  
Reg. No.: 52, 142

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)